



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,752	04/06/2006	Yunping Luo	TSRI 986.1	2531
2387	7590	10/08/2008	EXAMINER	
Olson & Cepuritis, LTD. 20 NORTH WACKER DRIVE 36TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			LI, QIAN JANICE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,752	LUO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Q. JANICE LI, M.D.	1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,6-11,17,23,26-30,36,38-40,43,45,46,53,58 and 59 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 6-11, 17, 23, 26-30, 36, 38-40, 43, 45, 46, 53, 58, 59 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and remarks filed on July 10, 2008 are acknowledged. Claims 2-5, 12-16, 18-22, 24, 25, 31-35, 37, 41, 42, 44, 47-52, 54-57, 60-65 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6-11, 17, 23, 26-30, 36, 38, 43, 45, 46, 53, 58 have been amended. Claims 1, 6-11, 17, 23, 26-30, 36, 38-40, 43, 45, 46, 53, 58, 59 are pending and under current examination.

Unless otherwise indicated, previous rejections that have been rendered moot in view of the amendment to pending claims will not be reiterated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 6-10, 17, 23, 26-30, 36, 38-40, 43, 45, 46, 53, 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *Luo et al.* (PNAS 2003 Jul;100:8850-5).

Luo teaches protection against breast cancer was achieved with a DNA vaccine against murine transcription factor Fos-related antigen 1 (mFra-1), which is overexpressed in aggressively proliferating D2F2 murine breast carcinoma. Growth of primary tumor and dissemination of pulmonary metastases was markedly suppressed by an oral DNA vaccine, which is carried by attenuated *Salmonella typhimurium*

bacteria, comprising a plasmid encoding murine Fra-1, fused with mutant polyubiquitin, and a plasmid encoding secretory murine IL-18. The life span of 60% of vaccinated mice was tripled and the absence of detectable tumor growth after lethal tumor cell challenge. Accordingly, *Luo* anticipates instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 11, 53, 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Luo et al.* (PNAS 2003 Jul;100:8850-5).

The teaching of *Luo* was detailed *supra*. Although *Luo* did not teach to include another plasmid encoding IL-12 in the oral DNA vaccine, *Luo* investigated the immunological mechanisms involved in the anti-tumor immune responses. *Luo* observed markedly increased specific target cell lysis, and a significant release of proinflammatory cytokines IFN-gamma and IL-2, and concluded that this multifunctional DNA vaccine proved effective in protecting against growth and metastases of breast cancer by combining the action of immune effector cells with suppression of tumor angiogenesis. *Luo* also teaches that IL-12 is capable of inducing IFN-g release (see Discussion, column 2, page 8854). Although the treatment was conducted in an animal model, it was a feasibility study for treating human cancer patients.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method taught by *Luo et al*, by including a plasmid expressing IL-12 in the bacteria carrier with a reasonable expectation of success. The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the claimed invention because it may further enhance the anti-tumor immune response. Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because a phrase such as “which bacteria” should be inserted before “comprising” in line 4 in order to clearly set forth the structure of the vaccine.

Claim 26 is objected to because a phrase such as “which bacteria” should be inserted before “comprising” in line 5.

Claim 17 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 6. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

No claim is allowed.

It is noted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action relies on a publication of which the applicant is a co-author. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Q. JANICE LI, M.D.** whose telephone number is **571-272-0730**. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM -7:00pm, Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Joseph Woitach** can be reached on **571-272-0739**. The **fax** numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at **800-786-9199.**

*/Q. JANICE LI, M.D./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633*